

11-1-2008

Metric Regularity of Mappings and Generalized Normals to Set Images

Boris S. Mordukhovich

Wayne State University, boris@math.wayne.edu

Nguyen Mau Nam

The University of Texas-Pan American, Edinburg, TX, nguyenmn@utpa.edu

Bingwu Wang

Eastern Michigan University, bwang@emunix.emich.edu

Recommended Citation

Mordukhovich, Boris S.; Nam, Nguyen Mau; and Wang, Bingwu, "Metric Regularity of Mappings and Generalized Normals to Set Images" (2008). *Mathematics Research Reports*. Paper 61.
http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/math_reports/61

This Technical Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Mathematics at DigitalCommons@WayneState. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mathematics Research Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@WayneState.

**METRIC REGULARITY OF MAPPINGS
AND GENERALIZED NORMALS TO SET IMAGES**

**BORIS S. MORDUKHOVICH, NGUYEN MAU NAM
and BINGWU WANG**

**WAYNE STATE
UNIVERSITY**

Detroit, MI 48202

**Department of Mathematics
Research Report**

**2008 Series
#11**

This research was partly supported by the National Science Foundation

METRIC REGULARITY OF MAPPINGS AND GENERALIZED NORMALS TO SET IMAGES

BORIS S. MORDUKHOVICH¹, NGUYEN MAU NAM² and BINGWU WANG³

Dedicated to Alex Ioffe in honor of his 70th birthday

Abstract. The primary goal of this paper is to study some notions of normals to nonconvex sets in finite-dimensional and infinite-dimensional spaces and their images under single-valued and set-valued mappings. The main motivation for our study comes from variational analysis and optimization, where the problems under consideration play a crucial role in many important aspects of generalized differential calculus and applications. Our major results provide precise equality formulas (sometimes just efficient upper estimates) allowing us to compute generalized normals in various senses to direct and inverse images of nonconvex sets under single-valued and set-valued mappings between Banach spaces. The main tools of our analysis revolve around variational principles and the fundamental concept of metric regularity properly modified in this paper.

AMS 2000 Subject Classification. Primary 49J52, 49J53; Secondary 46B20, 58C20, 90C31.

Key words and phrases. Variational analysis, metric regularity, generalized differentiation, normal cones, coderivatives, calculus rules, set images.

1 Introduction

This paper primarily concerns applications of the concept and machinery of *metric regularity* to deriving new results of generalized differential calculus and to the study of some other related issues of variational analysis. The concept of metric regularity goes back to the seminal Lyusternik-Graves theorem of the classical nonlinear analysis and has been long recognized among the most fundamental tools in the modern stage of nonlinear analysis especially regarding its variational aspects; see, e.g., the books [4, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21], the extended surveys [2, 6, 11], the papers [1, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19], and the references therein for more details as well as for recent developments. Alex Ioffe is surely one of the major original contributors and nowadays leaders in this and related fields of modern set-valued and variational analysis. The range and depth of his results on metric regularity, starting with the now classical work [9] and including the very recent paper [12], are difficult to overstate. In particular, he was the first to apply variational principles into the area of metric regularity, to derive quantitative estimates of the regularity/surjection moduli, to apply metric regularity to subdifferential calculus, to introduce and deeply investigate new notions of relative metric regularity, etc.

¹Department of Mathematics, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202, USA; email address: boris@math.wayne.edu. The research of this author was partially supported by the National Science Foundation under grant DMS-0603846.

²Department of Mathematics, The University of Texas–Pan American, Edinburg, TX 78539–2999, USA.

³Department of Mathematics, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI 48197, USA.

This paper is mainly devoted to new applications of variational/extremal principles and metric regularity to *generalized differential calculus* in both finite-dimensional and infinite-dimensional Banach spaces and also to calculus/preservation issues for the so-called *normal compactness* properties, which are automatic in finite dimensions while playing a crucial role in many aspects of infinite-dimensional variational analysis.

Having a single-valued mapping $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between Banach spaces and a set $\Omega \subset X$ with $\bar{x} \in \Omega$, we pay the major attention to evaluating generalized normals (in various senses) to the *image set* $f(\Omega)$ at the point $f(\bar{x})$. Our primary goal is to derive *precise* (equality-type) formulas for computing generalized normals under appropriate differentiability assumptions on f at \bar{x} in the framework of arbitrary Banach spaces with *no surjectivity* requirement on the derivative $\nabla f(\bar{x})$ as in the classical Lyusternik-Graves theorem.

It is well known that the surjectivity of $\nabla f(\bar{x})$ is a *characterization* of metric regularity for smooth (or strictly differentiable) mappings; see, e.g., [16, Theorem 1.57]. To deal with such mappings between Banach spaces that fail to have surjective derivatives at the points in question, we introduced in [18] the notion of *restrictive metric regularity* (RMR) for $f: X \rightarrow Y$ around the given point \bar{x} by considering the usual (metrically defined) property of metric regularity for the mapping f from the original domain space X to the *nonlinear* metric space $f(X) \subset Y$ instead of the original range space Y with a linear structure. The RMR notion and verifiable conditions for its validity obtained in [18] allowed us to derive therein equality formulas for computing Fréchet-like and limiting normals to *inverse images* $f^{-1}(\Theta)$ of arbitrary sets $\Theta \subset Y$ under strictly differentiable mappings f between Banach spaces such that the derivative $\nabla f(\bar{x})$ may not be surjective.

In this paper we continue the line of development in [18] focusing mainly on computing generalized normals to *direct images* $f(\Omega)$ under differentiable (not always strictly) mappings $f: X \rightarrow Y$, with deriving new results for various normals (not only Fréchet-like and limiting ones) to inverse images as well. In the majority of our new results we relax the aforementioned RMR property requiring the *metric regularity* of the mapping $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ between the both *metric spaces* Ω and $f(\Omega)$ (*around* and sometimes just *at* the reference point), verifiable conditions for the fulfillment of which are obtained by using advantages of the linear structure on the Banach spaces X and Y and differentiability of f . We also present counterparts of these results for evaluating (as upper estimates) generalized normals to images of *set-valued* mappings $F: X \rightrightarrows Y$ between Asplund spaces.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes some major constructions of *generalized differentiation* and related notions of variational analysis widely used in formulating and proving the main results below. In Section 3 we introduce and discuss various modifications of the concept of *restrictive metric regularity* and establish some verifiable conditions for their fulfillment in terms of pointbased generalized differential constructions.

Section 4 concerns evaluating *Fréchet normals* and ε -*normals* to set images under *Fréchet differentiable* single-valued mappings between Banach spaces and presents also some related and auxiliary material of independent interest. In Section 5 we deal with *sequential weak* limits* of Fréchet-like normals to direct and inverse set images in general Banach spaces as well as in some of their remarkable subclasses. We derive *upper estimate* and *equality* types results under relaxed RMR assumptions on strictly differentiable mappings. We also obtain

upper estimates for limiting normals to set images under *set-valued* mappings.

Section 6 is devoted to counterparts of the equality-type results from Section 4 for the so-called *Hölder s -normal cones* (with $s \in (0, 1]$) to direct and inverse images of sets under Hölder s -differentiable mappings between Banach spaces. In the case of $s = 1$ the Hölder normal cone reduces to the *proximal normal cone*, which may be smaller than the Fréchet one even in finite dimensions. Further, in this section we establish equality-type results for computing the *convexified normal cone* to direct and inverse set images, which agrees with the Clarke normal cone in reflexive spaces.

Our notation is basically conventional in variational analysis; see, e.g., [16, 20]. Unless otherwise stated, all the spaces under consideration are *Banach* with their norms denoted by $\|\cdot\|$ and the canonical pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ between the space X in question and its topological dual X^* . Recall that the symbol

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Lim\,sup}_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}} F(x) := \left\{ x^* \in X^* \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists \text{ sequences } x_k \rightarrow \bar{x} \text{ and } x_k^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x^* \\ \text{with } x_k^* \in F(x_k) \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

stands for the *sequential Painlevé-Kuratowski upper/outer limit* of a set-valued mapping $F: X \rightrightarrows X^*$ as $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$ in the norm topology of X and the weak* topology w^* of X^* , where $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Given a set $\Omega \subset X$, denote by $\operatorname{cl} \Omega$ and $\operatorname{co} \Omega$ the *closure* and *convex hull* of Ω , respectively; cl^* signifies the closure of a subset of the dual space in the *weak** topology. The symbol $x \xrightarrow{\Omega} \bar{x}$ means that $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$ with $x \in \Omega$. If no confusion arises, \mathbb{B} and \mathbb{B}^* stands for the *closed unit balls* of the space and dual space in question.

2 Constructions of Generalized Differentiation

In this section we present the underlying constructions of generalized differentiation and related properties of variational analysis widely used in the paper. We mainly follow the book [16] referring the reader also to [4, 11, 17, 20, 21] for associated and additional material.

Given a nonempty set $\Omega \subset X$ in a Banach space X and a number $\varepsilon \geq 0$, define the *collection of ε -normals* to Ω at $x \in \Omega$ by

$$\widehat{N}_\varepsilon(x; \Omega) := \left\{ x^* \in X^* \mid \limsup_{u \xrightarrow{\Omega} x} \frac{\langle x^*, u - x \rangle}{\|u - x\|} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \quad (2.1)$$

and let $\widehat{N}_\varepsilon(x; \Omega) := \emptyset$ if $x \notin \Omega$. When $\varepsilon = 0$ in (2.1), the set $\widehat{N}(x; \Omega) := \widehat{N}_0(x; \Omega)$ is a convex cone known as the *Fréchet or regular normal cone* to Ω at this point.

In general, we do not have satisfactory calculus and related properties for the normal collection (2.1) whenever $\varepsilon \geq 0$ even in finite dimensions; e.g., they may be trivial at boundary points of closed sets in \mathbb{R}^2 . Much better calculus rules and other properties hold for the *sequential outer limit* (1.1) of the constructions $\widehat{N}_\varepsilon(x; \Omega)$ given by

$$N(\bar{x}; \Omega) := \operatorname{Lim\,sup}_{\substack{x \rightarrow \bar{x} \\ \varepsilon \downarrow 0}} \widehat{N}_\varepsilon(x; \Omega) \quad (2.2)$$

and known as the *basic, or limiting, or Mordukhovich normal cone* to Ω at $\bar{x} \in \Omega$. It follows from (2.2) and (1.1) that $x^* \in N(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ if and only if there are sequences $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$, $x_k \xrightarrow{\Omega} \bar{x}$,

and $x_k^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $x_k^* \in \widehat{N}_{\varepsilon_k}(x_k; \Omega)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By [16, Theorem 2.35], we can equivalently let $\varepsilon = 0$ in (2.2) if the set Ω is locally closed around \bar{x} and if the space X is *Asplund*, i.e., every separable subspace of it has a separable dual. The class of Asplund spaces has been well investigated in geometric theory of Banach spaces and widely employed in variational analysis; see [4, 16, 17] for more details and references. Note, in particular, that any reflexive Banach space is Asplund while, e.g., the important classical spaces $C[0, 1]$ and $L^\infty[0, 1]$ are not.

Despite the *nonconvexity* of the limiting normal cone (2.2), or probably due to it, there is a fairly comprehensive amount of calculus rules available for this normal cone and the associated coderivative and subdifferential constructions, mainly in the Asplund space framework; see [16, Chapter 3] and the references therein. The list of calculus rules and related results for (2.2) known in general Banach spaces and largely presented in [16, Chapter 1] is by far less impressive. We extend this list in the paper.

Consider next a set-valued mapping $F: X \rightrightarrows Y$ between Banach spaces with the graph

$$\text{gph } F := \{(x, y) \in X \times Y \mid y \in F(x)\},$$

we define the coderivative constructions generated by the above normal cones as follows: the *Fréchet coderivative* of F at $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } F$ given by

$$\widehat{D}^*F(\bar{x}, \bar{y})(y^*) := \{x^* \in X^* \mid (x^*, -y^*) \in \widehat{N}((\bar{x}, \bar{y}); \text{gph } F)\}, \quad y^* \in Y^*, \quad (2.3)$$

the *normal coderivative* of F at $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } F$ given by

$$D_N^*F(\bar{x}, \bar{y})(y^*) := \{x^* \in X^* \mid (x^*, -y^*) \in N((\bar{x}, \bar{y}); \text{gph } F)\}, \quad y^* \in Y^*, \quad (2.4)$$

and the *mixed coderivative* of F at $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } F$ given by

$$D_M^*F(\bar{x}, \bar{y})(y^*) := \left\{x^* \in X^* \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists \text{ sequences } \varepsilon_k \downarrow 0, (x_k, y_k) \xrightarrow{\text{gph } F} (\bar{x}, \bar{y}), x_k^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x^*, \\ y_k^* \rightarrow y^* \text{ with } (x_k^*, -y_k^*) \in \widehat{N}_{\varepsilon_k}((x_k, y_k); \text{gph } F) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (2.5)$$

As before, note that we can equivalently put $\varepsilon_k \equiv 0$ in (2.5) if both spaces X and Y (and hence its product) are Asplund and if the graph of F is locally closed around (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) . Observe also that the normal coderivative (2.4) can be described in a similar limiting way as (2.5) with the replacement of the normal convergence $y_k^* \rightarrow y^*$ by the weak* one $y_k^* \xrightarrow{w^*} y^*$ in Y^* .

If $F = f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a single-valued mapping, we omit $\bar{y} = f(\bar{x})$ in the above coderivative notation. Note that $\widehat{D}^*f(\bar{x})(y^*) = \{\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^*\}$ when f is Fréchet differentiable at \bar{x} and

$$D_N^*f(\bar{x})(y^*) = D_M^*f(\bar{x})(y^*) = \{\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^*\}, \quad y^* \in Y^*, \quad (2.6)$$

when f is strictly differentiable at \bar{x} in the sense that

$$\lim_{x, u \rightarrow \bar{x}} \frac{f(u) - f(x) - \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}), u - x \rangle}{\|u - x\|} = 0,$$

which is automatic when $f \in C^1$ around \bar{x} .

Finally in this section, recall some normal compactness properties of sets and mappings used in the paper that are automatic in finite dimensions while playing a significant role

in infinite-dimensional variational analysis and its applications. Given a set $\Omega \subset X$, we say that it is *sequentially normally compact* (SNC) at $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ if for every sequences $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$, $x_k \xrightarrow{\Omega} \bar{x}$, and $x_k^* \in \widehat{N}_{\varepsilon_k}(x_k; \Omega)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the implication

$$[x_k^* \xrightarrow{w^*} 0] \implies [\|x_k^*\| \rightarrow 0] \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

which can be equivalently written with $\varepsilon_k \equiv 0$ when X is Asplund and Ω is locally closed around \bar{x} ; see [16]. This property is always implied by, being closely related to, the *compactly epi-Lipschitzian* property of sets in the sense of Borwein and Strójas [3], which is intrinsically defined in the primal space X while can be equivalently described in the dual space framework as a *topological* version of the SNC property; the reader can find all the details and comprehensive results in this direction in [8, 10].

A set-valued mapping $F: X \rightrightarrows Y$ is *SNC* at $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } F$ if its graph is SNC at this point. In the case of mappings (or sets in *product* spaces), a more delicate property of this type is important for variational theory and applications. We say that F is *partially SNC* (PSNC) at $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } F$ if for every sequences $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$, $(x_k, y_k) \xrightarrow{\text{gph } F} (\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, and $(x_k^*, y_k^*) \in \widehat{N}_{\varepsilon_k}((x_k, y_k); \text{gph } F)$ we have the implication

$$[x_k^* \xrightarrow{w^*} 0, \|y_k^*\| \rightarrow 0] \implies [\|x_k^*\| \rightarrow 0] \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

It follows from [16, Theorem 1.43] that the PSNC property of F at $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } F$ automatically holds for every mapping $F: X \rightrightarrows Y$ between Banach spaces satisfying the following *Lipschitz-like*, or *pseudo-Lipschitzian*, or *Aubin property* around (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) : there are neighborhoods U of \bar{x} and V of \bar{y} and a constant $\ell \geq 0$ such that

$$F(u) \cap V \subset F(x) + \ell \|u - x\| B \text{ whenever } x, u \in U. \quad (2.7)$$

The latter property is well known to *equivalent* to the *metric regularity* of the *inverse* mapping F^{-1} around (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) . Appropriate modifications of metric regularity for single-valued mappings are studied in the next section and are applied in what follows.

3 Versions of Restrictive Metric Regularity

Given a mapping $f: E_1 \rightarrow E_2$ between two *metric* spaces (E_1, d_1) and (E_2, d_2) , recall that this mapping is *metrically regular around* \bar{x} if there are neighborhoods U of \bar{x} and V of $f(\bar{x})$ and a constant $\mu > 0$ such that

$$\text{dist}(x; f^{-1}(y)) := \inf_{u \in f^{-1}(y)} d_1(x, u) \leq \mu d_2(f(x), y) \text{ for all } x \in U \text{ and } y \in V. \quad (3.1)$$

Furthermore, we say that f is *metrically regular at* \bar{x} if (3.1) holds with $x = \bar{x}$.

There are some conditions ensuring metric regularity of mappings between metric spaces in terms of the so-called *strong slopes*; see, e.g., [2, 11] and the references therein. Considerably larger amount of efficient conditions for metric regularity is available for mappings between *Banach* spaces, where the notions of classical and generalized derivatives as well as tangent and normal constructions associated with them play a significant role in the

study of metric regularity. We mention first of all the fundamental result known now as the Lyusternik-Graves theorem, which says that a mapping $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between Banach spaces strictly differentiable at \bar{x} is metrically regular around this point *if and only if* the derivative operator $\nabla f(\bar{x}): X \rightarrow Y$ is surjective. A full *coderivative* analog of this result is given in [15] for set-valued mappings between finite-dimensional spaces and in [16, Theorem 4.18] for mappings between Asplund spaces. We refer the reader to [4, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 20, 21] for the genesis of ideas and various approaches and for more results and discussions in this direction in finite-dimensional and infinite-dimensional Banach spaces.

It seems that the notion of *restrictive metric regularity* (RMR) introduced in [18] is the first one for mappings between Banach spaces, which combines advantages of Banach spaces with the general metric nature of metric regularity. Recall that $f: X \rightarrow Y$ has the *RMR property around \bar{x}* if the mapping $f: X \rightarrow f(X) \subset Y \subset U$ between the Banach space X and the metric space $(E_2, d_2) := (f(X), \|\cdot\|_Y)$ is metrically regular around \bar{x} in the sense of (3.1). A major result of [18] gives a full characterization of the RMR property of a mapping f strictly differentiable at \bar{x} as follows: f is RMR around \bar{x} *if and only if* the space $\nabla f(\bar{x})X$ is finite-codimensional in Y and

$$\tilde{T}(\bar{y}; f(X)) = \nabla f(\bar{x})X \quad \text{with } \bar{y} := f(\bar{x}),$$

where $\tilde{T}(\bar{y}; \Theta)$ stands for the so-called *paratingent cone* to $\Theta \subset Y$ defined by

$$\tilde{T}(\bar{y}; \Theta) := \{v \in Y \mid \exists v_k \rightarrow v, t_k \downarrow 0, y_k \xrightarrow{\Theta} \bar{y} \text{ with } y_k + t_k v_k \in \Theta\}.$$

In this paper we mainly study and employ another modification of the RMR notion, which deals with the metric regularity in the sense of (3.1) for the mapping $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ between the two metric spaces $(E_1, d_1) := (\Omega, \|\cdot\|_X)$ and $(E_2, d_2) := (f(\Omega), \|\cdot\|_Y)$.

In this section we present some sufficient conditions for this property in the case of strictly differentiable mappings f between Asplund spaces and locally closed sets Ω . The proof of this result is heavily based on the pointbased *coderivative* and *PSNC characterizations* of the *Lipschitz-like* property of *set-valued* mappings between Asplund spaces and efficient rules of the *generalized differential* and *SNC calculi* established in [16] for the limiting constructions involved.

Theorem 3.1 (sufficient conditions for metric regularity of restricted mappings). *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a mapping between Asplund spaces strictly differentiable at \bar{x} , and let Ω be a subset of X locally closed around $\bar{x} \in \Omega$. Impose further the qualification condition*

$$(\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(N(\bar{x}; \Omega)) = \{0\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Then the restricted mapping $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ between metric spaces is metrically regular around \bar{x} in each of the following cases:

- (a) *either the space Y is finite-dimensional,*
- (b) *or the space $\nabla f(\bar{x})X \subset Y$ is closed and the set Ω is SNC at \bar{x} .*

Proof. Denote $\bar{y} := f(\bar{x})$ and define a set-valued mapping $G: Y \rightrightarrows X$ by

$$G(y) := f^{-1}(y) \cap \Omega. \quad (3.3)$$

It follows directly from the definitions that the Lipschitz-like property (2.7) of the constructed mapping G around (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) implies the metric regularity of the restricted mapping $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ around \bar{x} in the metric sense (3.1). We intend in what follows to apply the aforementioned *coderivative characterization* of the Lipschitz-like property from [16, Theorem 4.10] to the mapping G from (3.3). To begin with, observe by (3.3) that

$$\text{gph } G = \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 \subset Y \times X, \quad (3.4)$$

where the sets $\Omega_1 := \{(y, x) \in Y \times X \mid y = f(x)\}$ and $\Omega_2 := Y \times \Omega$ are locally closed around the point (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) . Since both spaces X and Y are Asplund, the product space $Y \times X$ is Asplund as well. To estimate the limiting normal cone (2.2), we use the basic calculus result (normal cone *intersection rule*) result from [16, Theorem 3.4]. It is easy to see from the structures of Ω_1 and Ω_2 that

$$N((\bar{y}, \bar{x}); \Omega_1) = \{(y^*, -\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^*) \mid y^* \in Y^*\} \text{ and } N((\bar{y}, \bar{x}); \Omega_2) = \{0\} \times N(\bar{x}; \Omega).$$

This implies that the main qualification condition of [16, Theorem 3.4] formulated as

$$N((\bar{y}, \bar{x}); \Omega_1) \cap [-N((\bar{y}, \bar{x}); \Omega_2)] = \{0\} \quad (3.5)$$

is satisfied. To proceed, let us split the proof into the following two cases corresponding to the requirements in (a) and (b) in addition to the common assumptions of the theorem.

Case 1. *The range space Y is finite-dimensional.* It follows from the representation of Fréchet normal to the set Ω_1 with f strictly differentiable at \bar{x} (cf. the proof of [16, Theorem 1.38]) and the finite dimensionality of Y that the set Ω_1 is SNC at (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) . Applying now [16, Corollary 3.5] (a consequence of the aforementioned basic intersection rule) to the set intersection (3.4), we get

$$N((\bar{y}, \bar{x}); \text{gph } G) \subset N((\bar{y}, \bar{x}); \Omega_1) + N((\bar{y}, \bar{x}); \Omega_2). \quad (3.6)$$

This implies, by the above normal cone formulas for Ω_1 and Ω_2 , that

$$N((\bar{y}, \bar{x}); \text{gph } G) \subset \{(y^*, -\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^* + N(\bar{x}; \Omega)) \mid y^* \in Y^*\}. \quad (3.7)$$

The latter allows us to conclude, due to the qualification condition (3.2), that

$$D_M^* G(\bar{y}, \bar{x})(0) \subset D_N^* G(\bar{y}, \bar{x})(0) = \{0\}. \quad (3.8)$$

The inclusion in (3.8) is obvious; so it remains to observe by the normal coderivative definition (2.4) that the required implication

$$(y^*, 0) \in N((\bar{y}, \bar{x}); \text{gph } G) \implies y^* = 0$$

in (3.8) directly follows from (3.7) due to the imposed qualification condition (3.2).

To conclude that the mapping $G: Y \rightrightarrows X$ in (3.3) is Lipschitz-like around (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) by using the coderivative criterion from [16, Theorem 4.10(c)], it is sufficient to observe that G is obviously *PSNC* at (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) , since Y is finite-dimensional in the case under consideration.

Case 2. *The image space $\nabla f(\bar{x})X$ is closed in Y and the set Ω is SNC at \bar{x} .* We begin with a simple observation that the qualification condition (3.2) implies the *injectivity* of the adjoint derivative operator, i.e., the validity of the inclusion

$$\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^* = 0 \implies y^* = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Indeed, assuming that (3.9) does not hold, we find $y^* \neq 0$ such that

$$y^* \in (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(0) \subset (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(N(\bar{x}; \Omega)) = \{0\},$$

which contradicts the qualification condition (3.2). The injectivity of the adjoint operator $\nabla f(\bar{x})^*$ implies, by the closedness requirement on $\nabla f(\bar{x})X$, that in fact $\nabla f(\bar{x})X = Y$.

To ensure that $D_M^* G(\bar{y}, \bar{x})(0) = \{0\}$, we proceed similarly to Case 1 observing that the calculus rule in (3.6) holds by [16, Corollary 3.5] under the qualification condition (3.5) due to the SNC property of Ω_2 at (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) , which is obviously implied by the assumed SNC property of Ω at \bar{x} . To conclude now by [16, Theorem 4.10(c)] that the mapping $G: Y \rightrightarrows X$ in (3.3) is Lipschitz-like around (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) , it remains to check that G is PSNC at this point. Since the qualification condition (3.5) and the SNC property of Ω_2 at (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) are satisfied and the product space $Y \times X$ is Asplund, we have from [16, Corollary 3.80] that the mapping G is PSNC at (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) , which is the same as the PSNC property of the graph $\text{gph } G$ with respect to Y , *provided* that the set Ω_1 in the intersection representation of this graph in (3.4) is PSNC with respect to Y at (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) , i.e.,

$$[y_k^* \xrightarrow{w^*} 0, \|x_k^*\| \rightarrow 0, (y_k^*, x_k^*) \in \widehat{N}((y_k, x_k); \Omega_1)] \implies \|y_k^*\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.10)$$

Taking into account that $\Omega_1 = \text{gph } f^{-1}$, observe that the implication in (3.10) means that the mapping $f^{-1}: Y \rightrightarrows X$ is PSNC at (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) in the sense defined in Section 1. Recall that, by [16, Theorem 1.43], the PSNC property of f^{-1} at (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) is implied by the Lipschitz-like property of f^{-1} around this point, which is equivalent to the metric regularity of f around \bar{x} . As shown above, $\nabla f(\bar{x})X = Y$ under the assumptions made in (b), which thus ensure the required metric regularity by the classical Lyusternik-Graves theorem. We have therefore the Lipschitz-like property of the mapping G in (3.3) around (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) in Case 2 and complete the proof of the theorem in both cases under consideration. \triangle

4 Fréchet-Like Normals to Set Images

In this section we mainly concentrate on computing Fréchet normals and their ε -enlargements to images of sets in Banach spaces under Fréchet and strictly differentiable mappings satisfying the metric regularity requirements introduced and discussed in Section 3.

To proceed, we need the following tangential construction generated in duality by the Fréchet normal cone (2.1) as $\varepsilon = 0$. Given a set $\Omega \subset X$ and a point $\bar{x} \in \Omega$, define the *Fréchet tangent cone* to Ω at \bar{x} by

$$\widehat{T}(\bar{x}; \Omega) := \{v \in X \mid \langle x^*, v \rangle \leq 0 \text{ for all } x^* \in \widehat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega)\}. \quad (4.1)$$

A natural question that immediately arises is about relationships between the Fréchet tangent cone (4.1) and the widely spread in variational analysis tangential construction

$$T(\bar{x}; \Omega) := \{v \in X \mid \exists v_k \rightarrow v, t_k \downarrow 0 \text{ with } \bar{x} + t_k v_k \in \Omega\} \quad (4.2)$$

known as the *Bouligand-Severi contingent cone* to Ω at \bar{x} ; see [16, Subsection 1.1.2] and the commentaries therein. The following proposition establishes such relationships in the general Banach space setting.

Proposition 4.1 (relationships between the Fréchet tangent cone and Bouligand-Severi contingent cone to arbitrary sets). *Let Ω be a nonempty subset of a Banach space X , and let $\bar{x} \in \Omega$. Then we always have the inclusion*

$$\text{clco } T(\bar{x}; \Omega) \subset \widehat{T}(\bar{x}; \Omega), \quad (4.3)$$

which becomes an equality provided that

$$\widehat{N}(0; \text{clco } T(\bar{x}; \Omega)) \subset \widehat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega). \quad (4.4)$$

Furthermore, condition (4.4) is satisfied in each of the following cases:

(a) *For any sequence $x_k \xrightarrow{\Omega} \bar{x}$ with $x_k \neq \bar{x}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the normalized sequence*

$$\left\{ \frac{x_k - \bar{x}}{\|x_k - \bar{x}\|} \right\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

contains a convergent subsequence as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This is true, in particular, when there is a neighborhood U of \bar{x} such that the spanned space $\text{span}(\Omega \cap (U - \bar{x}))$ is finite-dimensional, which is automatic if the original space X is finite-dimensional.

(b) *There is a neighborhood U of \bar{x} such that*

$$\Omega \cap U \subset \bar{x} + \text{clco } T(\bar{x}; \Omega),$$

which surely holds if $\Omega \cap U \subset \bar{x} + T(\bar{x}; \Omega)$. The latter is satisfied, in particular, when the set Ω is either convex or conic around \bar{x} .

Proof. To justify (4.3), it is sufficient to show that $T(\bar{x}; \Omega) \subset \widehat{T}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$, since the Fréchet tangent cone $\widehat{T}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ is obviously closed and convex. Pick any $v \in T(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ and by definition (4.2) find sequences $v_k \rightarrow v$ and $t_k \downarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\bar{x} + t_k v_k \in \Omega$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ and using definition (2.1) of Fréchet normals, we have

$$\langle x^*, t_k v_k \rangle \leq \varepsilon \|t_k v_k\| \quad \text{for all large } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

which implies that $\langle x^*, v \rangle \leq 0$ by passing to the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and taking into account that $\varepsilon > 0$ was chosen arbitrarily. The latter inequality means that $v \in \widehat{T}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$, and thus we get the required inclusion (4.3).

Let us further prove that the *equality* holds in (4.3) under the assumption (4.4). To proceed, suppose the opposite and find an element $v \in \widehat{T}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ with $v \notin \text{clco } T(\bar{x}; \Omega)$. By the classical *convex separation* theorem, there is $x^* \in X^*$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\langle x^*, v \rangle > \gamma > \langle x^*, x \rangle \quad \text{for all } x \in \text{clco } T(\bar{x}; \Omega). \quad (4.5)$$

This implies that $\gamma > 0$, since $0 \in \text{clco } T(\bar{x}; \Omega)$. Taking now into account that $\text{clco } T(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ is a cone, we get from the second inequality in (4.5) that

$$\langle x^*, x \rangle \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \text{clco } T(\bar{x}; \Omega),$$

which gives $x^* \in \widehat{N}(0; \text{clco } T(\bar{x}; \Omega)) \subset \widehat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ by the assumption made in (4.4). On the other hand, it follows from the first inequality in (4.5) that $x^* \notin \widehat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$, since otherwise

we have $\langle x^*, v \rangle \leq 0$. This contradiction justifies the equality in (4.3) under the validity of (4.4). The fulfillment of (4.4) under the conditions imposed in either (a) or (b) easily follows from the above definitions of the contingent cone and the Fréchet normal cone to the set in question. This completes the proof of the proposition. \triangle

The next theorem contains two independent relationships between the Fréchet normal cone to a set Ω and to a set image $f(\Omega)$ under a Fréchet differentiable mapping f while imposing the *metric regularity* property of $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ at the point $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ in question.

Theorem 4.2 (Fréchet normals to direct images of sets under differentiable mappings). *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a mapping between Banach spaces such that f is Fréchet differentiable at $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ and the restricted mapping $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ is metrically regular at this point. Denote $\bar{y} := f(\bar{x})$. Then we have the equality*

$$\hat{N}(\bar{y}; f(\Omega)) = (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\hat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega)). \quad (4.6)$$

Furthermore, we have another equality

$$\nabla f(\bar{x})^* \hat{N}(\bar{y}; f(\Omega)) = \hat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega). \quad (4.7)$$

provided that the space $\nabla f(\bar{x})X$ is closed in Y and that

$$\ker \nabla f(\bar{x}) \subset \hat{T}(\bar{x}; \Omega), \quad (4.8)$$

where the latter condition is necessary for the fulfillment of (4.7).

Proof. Observe that the Fréchet differentiability of f at \bar{x} implies the existence of a number $\ell > 0$ and a neighborhood U of \bar{x} such that

$$\|f(x) - f(\bar{x})\| \leq \ell \|x - \bar{x}\| \text{ for all } x \in U.$$

Fix any $y^* \in \hat{N}(\bar{y}; f(\Omega))$ and get from the definition of Fréchet normals that

$$\limsup_{y \xrightarrow{f(\Omega)} \bar{y}} \frac{\langle y^*, y - \bar{y} \rangle}{\|y - \bar{y}\|} \leq 0.$$

Applying the following transformations and estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{x \xrightarrow{\Omega} \bar{x}} \frac{\langle \nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^*, x - \bar{x} \rangle}{\|x - \bar{x}\|} &= \limsup_{x \xrightarrow{\Omega} \bar{x}} \frac{\langle y^*, \nabla f(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) \rangle}{\|x - \bar{x}\|} \\ &\leq \limsup_{x \xrightarrow{\Omega} \bar{x}} \frac{\langle y^*, \nabla f(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) - f(x) + f(\bar{x}) + f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle}{\|x - \bar{x}\|} \\ &\leq \limsup_{x \xrightarrow{\Omega} \bar{x}} \frac{\langle y^*, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle}{\|x - \bar{x}\|} \leq \max \left\{ 0, \limsup_{y \xrightarrow{f(\Omega)} \bar{y}} \frac{\langle y^*, y - \bar{y} \rangle}{\ell^{-1} \|y - \bar{y}\|} \right\} \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

we arrive at $\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^* \in \hat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$, which justifies the inclusion “ \subset ” in (4.6).

To prove the opposite inclusion in (4.6), employ the *metric regularity* of $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ at \bar{x} and find a number $\mu > 0$ such that for any $y \in f(\Omega)$ close to $\bar{y} = f(\bar{x})$ we have

$$\text{dist}(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(y) \cap \Omega) \leq \mu \|y - \bar{y}\|. \quad (4.9)$$

Fix any y^* satisfying $\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^* \in \widehat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\langle y^*, \nabla f(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) \rangle \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\| \quad \text{whenever } \|x - \bar{x}\| < \eta \text{ and } x \in \Omega. \quad (4.10)$$

It follows from (4.10) and the Fréchet differentiability of f at \bar{x} that for some $\nu < \eta$ we have

$$\langle y^*, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle \leq \varepsilon \|x - \bar{x}\| \quad \text{whenever } \|x - \bar{x}\| < \nu \text{ and } x \in \Omega.$$

Observe that estimate (4.9) ensures that for any $y \in f(\Omega)$ sufficiently close to \bar{y} there is $x_y \in f^{-1}(y) \cap \Omega$ satisfying $\|x_y - \bar{x}\| \leq 2\mu \|y - \bar{y}\| < \nu$. For such x_y we have

$$\langle y^*, y - \bar{y} \rangle = \langle y^*, f(x_y) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle \leq \varepsilon \|x_y - \bar{x}\| \leq 2\mu \varepsilon \|y - \bar{y}\|,$$

which implies that $y^* \in \widehat{N}(\bar{y}; f(\Omega))$, since $\varepsilon > 0$ was chosen arbitrarily. This justifies the inclusion “ \supset ” in (4.6) and thus the equality therein.

Next we prove representation (4.7) under the additional assumptions made. By (4.6), it suffices to verify the inclusion

$$\widehat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega) \subset \nabla f(\bar{x})^* \widehat{N}(\bar{y}; f(\Omega)). \quad (4.11)$$

To proceed, pick arbitrary $x^* \in \widehat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ and $v \in \widehat{T}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ and get by definition (4.1) that $\langle x^*, v \rangle \leq 0$. This implies, since $-v \in \ker \nabla f(\bar{x})$ whenever $v \in \ker \nabla f(\bar{x})$, that

$$\langle x^*, v \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in \ker \nabla f(\bar{x}) \quad (4.12)$$

due to the assumed inclusion (4.8). Define now a bounded linear functional y^* on the closed subspace $\nabla f(\bar{x})X$ of Y by

$$\langle y^*, y \rangle = \langle x^*, x \rangle \quad \text{for some } x \in \nabla f(\bar{x})^{-1}(y).$$

It follows from (4.12) that y^* is well defined on $\nabla f(\bar{x})X$. Using the classical *Hahn-Banach theorem*, we extend y^* to a bounded linear functional on the whole space Y , i.e., can identify it with $y^* \in Y^*$. The construction of y^* implies that $\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^* = x^*$. Furthermore, by the above proof of the inclusion “ \supset ” in (4.6), we have $y^* \in \widehat{N}(\bar{y}; f(\Omega))$ and thus justify (4.7).

It remains to show that the kernel condition (4.8) is in fact *necessary* for the fulfillment of representation (4.7). To proceed, assume that (4.7) holds and take any $v \in \ker \nabla f(\bar{x})$. Then we obviously have the equality

$$\langle \nabla f(\bar{x})v, y^* \rangle = 0 \iff \langle v, \nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^* \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } y^* \in \widehat{N}(\bar{y}; f(\Omega)).$$

By the assumed condition (4.7), the latter yields that $\langle v, x^* \rangle = 0$ for all $x^* \in \widehat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$. Hence we get $v \in \widehat{T}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ by definition (4.1) and complete the proof of the theorem. \triangle

Next we study a special class of sets $\Omega \subset X$ in Theorem 4.2, which are representable as *inverse images* $f^{-1}(\Theta)$ of some subsets $\Theta \subset Y$ of the range space for the mappings $f: X \rightarrow Y$ from the theorem. We obtain efficient conditions that ensure the fulfillment of the kernel requirement (4.8) and of the equality in (4.7) for such sets. Let us first present a result that justifies the kernel condition (4.8) for inverse images and contains an additional information of certain independent interest.

Proposition 4.3 (kernel condition for inverse images). *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a mapping between Banach spaces that is Gâteaux differentiable at \bar{x} , and let $\bar{y} := f(\bar{x})$. Assume that the restricted mapping $f: X \rightarrow f(X)$ is metrically regular at \bar{x} . Then we have the inclusion*

$$\ker \nabla f(\bar{x}) \subset T(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\bar{y})), \quad (4.13)$$

which holds as equality provided that f is Fréchet differentiable at \bar{x} .

Proof. To justify (4.13), pick any $v \in \ker \nabla f(\bar{x})$ and observe, by the Gâteaux differentiability of f at \bar{x} , that

$$\frac{f(\bar{x} + t_k v) - \bar{y}}{t_k} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

whenever $t_k \downarrow 0$. Since $f: X \rightarrow f(X)$ is assumed to be metrically regular at \bar{x} , for any large $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we find $x_k \in f^{-1}(\bar{y})$ such that

$$w_k := \frac{\bar{x} + t_k v - x_k}{t_k} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then we have $(x_k - \bar{x})/t_k = v - w_k \rightarrow v$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, which gives $v \in T(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ by definition (4.2) of the contingent cone and thus justifies the required inclusion (4.13).

To prove the converse inclusion to (4.13), take any $v \in T(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\bar{y}))$ and by definition (4.2) find sequences $x_k \rightarrow \bar{x}$ with $x_k \in f^{-1}(\bar{y})$ and $t_k \downarrow 0$ such that $(x_k - \bar{x})/t_k \rightarrow v$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By the the Fréchet differentiability of f at \bar{x} we have

$$\frac{f(x_k) - f(\bar{x}) - \nabla f(\bar{x})(x_k - \bar{x})}{t_k} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

which gives $v \in \ker \nabla f(\bar{x})$ and completes the proof of the proposition. \triangle

The following result presents consequences of Theorem 4.2 for Fréchet normals to inverse images of sets. The second formula in this corollary is based on Proposition 4.3 and extends the corresponding one in [16, Theorem 1.14], where $\nabla f(\bar{x})$ is assumed to be surjective (and hence metrically regular at \bar{x}) that allows us to drop $f(X)$ in the latter formula.

Corollary 4.4 (Fréchet normals to inverse images of sets). *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a mapping between Banach spaces, and let Θ be a subset of Y such that f is Fréchet differentiable at \bar{x} and that $\bar{y} := f(\bar{x}) \in \Theta$. Assume that the restricted mapping $f: f^{-1}(\Theta) \rightarrow \Theta \cap f(X)$ is metrically regular at \bar{x} . Then*

$$(\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1} \widehat{N}(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\Theta)) = \widehat{N}(f(\bar{x}); \Theta \cap f(X)).$$

Furthermore, we have the equality

$$\widehat{N}(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\Theta)) = \nabla f(\bar{x})^* \widehat{N}(f(\bar{x}); \Theta \cap f(X))$$

provided that the mapping $f: X \rightarrow f(X)$ is metrically regular at \bar{x} .

Proof. The first equality in the corollary follows directly from equality (4.6) of Theorem 4.2 with $\Omega = f^{-1}(\Theta)$. The second one follows from (4.7), Proposition 4.3, and the fact that the subspace $\nabla f(\bar{x})X$ is closed in Y if the restricted mapping $f: X \rightarrow f(X)$ is metrically regular at \bar{x} . The latter is proved in [18, Theorem 2.2] (see also [16, Lemma 1.56]), where the RMR property of f at \bar{x} is actually used, although the formulation involves this property around \bar{x} . Note that the metric regularity of $f: X \rightarrow f(X)$ at \bar{x} surely implies that of $f: f^{-1}(\Theta) \rightarrow \Theta \cap f(X)$ at this point. Thus we meet all the assumptions of Theorem 4.2 for $\Omega = f^{-1}(\Theta)$ and complete the proof of the corollary. \triangle

Next we study some relations for ε -normals (2.1) to sets and set images (direct and inverse) under *strictly* differentiable mappings between Banach spaces. We derive certain *perturbed/fuzzy* counterparts of the results for Fréchet normals obtained above imposing similar metric regularity assumptions on restricted mappings that are required now *around* the reference points (not “at” as above). The results established here for ε -normals are of independent interest while their main role in this paper concerns applications to new formulas for *limiting normals* to set images developed in Section 5.

Our first result on ε -normals to set images gives a *uniform* fuzzy analog of formula (4.6) via the *rate of strict differentiability* of f at \bar{x} introduced in [18] by

$$r_f(\bar{x}; \eta) := \sup_{\substack{x, u \in \bar{x} + \eta B \\ u \neq x}} \frac{\|f(u) - f(x) - \nabla f(\bar{x})(u - x)\|}{\|u - x\|}, \quad (4.14)$$

where $\eta > 0$; see also [16, Subsection 1.1.3] for more details. It easily follows from (4.14) that $r_f(\bar{x}; \eta) \downarrow 0$ as $\eta \downarrow 0$ if f is strictly differentiable at \bar{x} .

Theorem 4.5 (estimates of ε -normals to set images via the rate of strict differentiability). *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a mapping between Banach spaces, and let $\bar{x} \in \Omega \subset X$. Assume that f is strictly differentiable at $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ with the rate of strictly differentiability $r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)$ defined in (4.14). Then the following hold:*

(i) *There are numbers $c > 0$ and $\bar{\eta} > 0$ such that for any $y^* \in \widehat{N}_\varepsilon(f(x); f(\Omega))$, $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $x \in (\bar{x} + \eta B) \cap \Omega$, and $0 < \eta \leq \bar{\eta}$ we have the inclusion*

$$y^* \in (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\widehat{N}_\gamma(x; \Omega)) \quad \text{with } \gamma := c\varepsilon + \|y^*\|r_f(\bar{x}; \eta). \quad (4.15)$$

(ii) *Assume in addition that the restricted mapping $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ is metrically regular around \bar{x} . Then there are numbers $c > 0$ and $\bar{\eta} > 0$ such that for any $y^* \in (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}\widehat{N}_\varepsilon(x; \Omega)$, $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $x \in (\bar{x} + \eta B) \cap \Omega$, and $0 < \eta \leq \bar{\eta}$ we have the inclusion*

$$y^* \in \widehat{N}_\nu(f(x); f(\Omega)) \quad \text{with } \nu := c\varepsilon + c\|y^*\|r_f(\bar{x}; \eta). \quad (4.16)$$

Proof. Since f is strictly differentiable at \bar{x} , it is locally Lipschitzian around this point, i.e., there are $\ell > 0$ and $\bar{\eta} > 0$ such that f is Lipschitz continuous on the set $\bar{x} + \bar{\eta}B$ with

constant ℓ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{u \xrightarrow{\Omega} x} \frac{\langle \nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^*, u - x \rangle}{\|u - x\|} &= \limsup_{u \xrightarrow{\Omega} x} \frac{\langle y^*, \nabla f(\bar{x})(u - x) \rangle}{\|u - x\|} \\
&= \limsup_{u \xrightarrow{\Omega} x} \frac{\langle y^*, f(u) - f(x) \rangle}{\|u - x\|} + \|y^*\| r_f(\bar{x}; \eta) \\
&\leq \limsup_{v \xrightarrow{f(\Omega)} f(x)} \max \left\{ 0, \frac{\langle y^*, v - f(x) \rangle}{\ell^{-1} \|v - f(x)\|} \right\} + \|y^*\| r_f(\bar{x}; \eta) \\
&\leq \ell \varepsilon + \|y^*\| r_f(\bar{x}; \eta) \quad \text{for all } \eta \in (0, \bar{\eta}].
\end{aligned}$$

This gives the inclusion $\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^* \in \widehat{N}_\gamma(x; \Omega)$ with $c := \ell$ and γ defined in (4.15). Thus $y^* \in (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\widehat{N}_\gamma(x; \Omega))$, which justifies assertion (i).

To prove (ii), we employ the *metric regularity* of $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ around \bar{x} and find numbers $\mu > 0$ and $\bar{\eta} > 0$ such that

$$\text{dist}(x; f^{-1}(y) \cap \Omega) \leq \mu \|y - f(x)\| \quad \text{for any } x \in (\bar{x} + \bar{\eta}B) \cap \Omega \text{ and } y \in f(\Omega) \quad (4.17)$$

with y close to $f(x)$. Pick any $y^* \in (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}\widehat{N}(x; \Omega)$ for such x with some $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and get by definition (2.1) the two equivalent inequalities

$$\left[\limsup_{u \xrightarrow{\Omega} x} \frac{\langle \nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^*, u - x \rangle}{\|u - x\|} \leq \varepsilon \right] \iff \left[\limsup_{u \xrightarrow{\Omega} x} \frac{\langle y^*, \nabla f(\bar{x})(u - x) \rangle}{\|u - x\|} \leq \varepsilon \right].$$

The latter implies by construction (4.14) that

$$\limsup_{u \xrightarrow{\Omega} x} \frac{\langle y^*, f(u) - f(x) \rangle}{\|u - x\|} \leq \varepsilon + \|y^*\| r_f(\bar{x}; \eta) \quad \text{for any } 0 < \eta \leq \bar{\eta}.$$

Fix $x \in (\bar{x} + \eta B) \cap \Omega$ and, by metric regularity (4.17), for each $y \in f(\Omega)$ close to $f(x)$ find $x_y \in f^{-1}(y) \cap \Omega$ satisfying $\|x - x_y\| \leq \mu \|y - f(x)\|$. Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{y \xrightarrow{f(\Omega)} f(x)} \frac{\langle y^*, y - f(x) \rangle}{\|y - f(x)\|} &\leq \limsup_{v \xrightarrow{f(\Omega)} f(x)} \frac{\langle y^*, f(x_y) - f(x) \rangle}{\|f(x_y) - f(x)\|} \\
&\leq \limsup_{y \xrightarrow{f(\Omega)} f(x)} \max \left\{ 0, \frac{\langle y^*, f(x_y) - f(x) \rangle}{\mu^{-1} \|x_y - x\|} \right\} \\
&\leq \mu \varepsilon + \mu \|y^*\| r_f(\bar{x}; \eta) \quad \text{whenever } 0 < \eta \leq \bar{\eta}.
\end{aligned}$$

This justifies the inclusion $y^* \in \widehat{N}_\nu(f(x); f(\Omega))$ with $c := \mu$ and ν defined in (4.16) and thus completes the proof of the theorem. \triangle

The next result a fuzzy ε -normal counterpart of the inclusion “ \supset ” in (4.7); the opposite inclusion of this type is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.5(ii). To proceed in this direction, we introduce a new concept used in what follows.

Definition 4.6 (tangential distance for sets). Let Ω be a subset of a Banach space X with $\bar{x} \in \Omega$, and let L be a linear subspace of X . The TANGENTIAL DISTANCE between Ω and L at \bar{x} with accuracy $\eta \geq 0$ is defined by

$$\text{tand}_{\Omega, L}(\bar{x}; \eta) := \sup_{u \in L \setminus \{0\}, x \in (\bar{x} + \eta B) \cap \Omega} \liminf_{v \xrightarrow{\Omega} x} \left\| \frac{u}{\|u\|} - \frac{v - x}{\|v - x\|} \right\| \quad (4.18)$$

with the conventions that

$$\frac{v-x}{\|v-x\|} := 0 \text{ if } v=x \text{ and } \text{tand}_{\Omega,L}(\bar{x};\eta) := 0 \text{ if } L = \{0\}.$$

For simplicity we denote $\text{tand}_{\Omega,L}(\bar{x}) := \text{tand}_{\Omega,L}(\bar{x};0)$.

It is easy to observe from Definition 4.6 and construction (4.2) of the contingent cone that we have the estimate

$$\text{tand}_{\Omega,L}(\bar{x};\eta) \leq \sup_{u \in L \setminus \{0\}, x \in (\bar{x} + \eta B) \cap \Omega} \text{dist}\left(\frac{u}{\|u\|}; T(x; \Omega)\right) \quad (4.19)$$

provided that the space X is finite-dimensional. In Section 5 we present more results on the tangential distance for image sets generated by strictly differentiable mappings.

Theorem 4.7 (estimates of ε -normals via tangential distance). *Let $\Omega \subset X$ be a subset of a Banach space with $\bar{x} \in \Omega$, and let $\varepsilon \geq 0$. The following assertions hold:*

(i) *Given a linear bounded operator $A: X \rightarrow Y$ between Banach spaces with the closed range $AX \subset Y$ and given $x^* \in \hat{N}_\varepsilon(\bar{x}; \Omega)$, there is $y^* \in Y^*$ such that*

$$A^*y^* \in x^* + \gamma B^* \text{ with } \gamma := \varepsilon + \text{tand}_{\Omega, \ker A}(\bar{x})\|x^*\|. \quad (4.20)$$

(ii) *Assume that a mapping $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between Banach spaces is strictly differentiable at \bar{x} , that the subspace $\nabla f(\bar{x})X$ is closed in Y , and that the restrictive mapping $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ is metrically regular around \bar{x} . Then there are numbers $c > 0$ and $\bar{\eta} > 0$ such that for any $x^* \in \hat{N}_\varepsilon(x; \Omega)$ and $x \in (\bar{x} + \eta B) \cap \Omega$ as $0 < \eta \leq \bar{\eta}$ there exists a perturbation*

$$\hat{x}^* \in x^* + \gamma B^* \text{ with } \gamma := \varepsilon + \text{tand}_{\Omega, \nabla f(\bar{x})}(\bar{x})\|x^*\| \quad (4.21)$$

satisfying the conditions $(\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\hat{x}^*) \neq \emptyset$ and

$$(\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\hat{x}^*) \subset \hat{N}_\nu(f(x); f(\Omega)) \quad (4.22)$$

with $\nu := c(\varepsilon + \text{tand}_{\Omega, \ker \nabla f(\bar{x})}(\bar{x}; \eta)\|x^*\| + r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)\|y^*\|)$.

Proof. To justify assertion (i), take any $x^* \in \hat{N}_\varepsilon(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ and, by the definition of ε -normals, for every $\sigma > 0$ there is a neighborhood U of \bar{x} such that

$$\langle x^*, x - \bar{x} \rangle \leq (\varepsilon + \sigma)\|x - \bar{x}\| \text{ whenever } x \in U. \quad (4.23)$$

Further, pick any $u \in \ker A \setminus \{0\}$ and, by Definition 4.18 with $L = \ker A$, find $v \in U$ satisfying the estimate

$$\left\| \frac{u}{\|u\|} - \frac{v - \bar{x}}{\|v - \bar{x}\|} \right\| < \text{tand}_{\Omega, \ker A}(\bar{x}) + \sigma$$

with the same $\sigma > 0$ as in (4.23). Unifying the latter with (4.23), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x^*, u \rangle &= \left\langle x^*, \frac{u}{\|u\|} - \frac{v - \bar{x}}{\|v - \bar{x}\|} \right\rangle + \left\langle x^*, \frac{v - \bar{x}}{\|v - \bar{x}\|} \right\rangle \|u\| \\ &\leq \left(\|x^*\| (\text{tand}_{\Omega, \ker A}(\bar{x}) + \sigma) + (\varepsilon + \sigma) \right) \|u\|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that $\sigma > 0$ was chosen arbitrarily, this implies that

$$\langle x^*, u \rangle \leq \gamma \|u\| \text{ for all } u \in \ker A$$

with γ defined in (4.20). The Hahn-Banach theorem allows us to extend $x^*|_{\ker A}$ to a linear functional $\tilde{x}^* \in X^*$ with $\|\tilde{x}^*\| \leq \gamma$. Denote now $\hat{x}^* := x^* - \tilde{x}^*$ and define $y^* \in (AX)^*$ by

$$\langle y^*, y \rangle = \langle \hat{x}^*, x \rangle \text{ for some } x \in A^{-1}(y).$$

Since $\hat{x}^*|_{\ker A} = 0$, the linear functional y^* is well defined on AX and, furthermore, it is bounded on this subspace due to its assumed closedness in Y . Employing again the Hahn-Banach theorem, we extend y^* to a linear bounded functional $y^* \in Y^*$. Finally, it is easy to check that $A^*y^* = \hat{x}^* \in x^* + \gamma B^*$, which gives (4.20) and thus justifies assertion (i).

To prove assertion (ii) of the theorem, we first apply the result of assertion (i) with $A = \nabla f(\bar{x})$, which allows us to find $\hat{x}^* \in X^*$ satisfying (4.21) and $(\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\hat{x}^*) \neq \emptyset$. Taking then any $y^* \in (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\hat{x}^*)$, we easily have $\nabla f(\bar{x})^*y^* \in \hat{N}_{\varepsilon+\gamma}(x; \Omega)$. Finally, assertion (ii) of Theorem 4.5 implies that $y^* \in \hat{N}_\nu(f(x); f(\Omega))$ with ν defined in (4.22). This completes the proof of (ii) and of the whole theorem. \triangle

5 The Limiting Normal Cone to Set Images

The primary goal of this section is to establish relationships between the *limiting normals* (2.2) to sets and to set images (direct and inverse) under strictly differentiable mappings acting in Banach spaces. We also obtain some counterparts (as upper estimates) of calculus results for limiting normals to direct images of sets under set-valued mappings.

A natural way to derive the corresponding formulas for limiting normals to set images under strictly differentiable mappings is to pass to the limit in the “fuzzy” results of Theorems 4.5 and 4.7 for ε -normals. To proceed carefully in this direction, we need to designate appropriate properties of the sets, mappings, and spaces under consideration. The following property of Banach spaces, introduced in [18] in a different framework and largely discussed in [16, Subsection 1.3.5], plays a significant role in justifying the limiting procedure.

Definition 5.1 (weak*-extensibility). *Let L be a closed linear subspace of a Banach space X . We say that L is w^* -EXTENSIBLE in X if every sequence $\{v_k^*\} \subset L^*$, with $v_k^* \xrightarrow{w^*} 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ contains a subsequence $\{v_{k_j}^*\}$ such that each $v_{k_j}^*$ can be extended to a linear bounded functional $x_j^* \in X^*$ with $x_j^* \xrightarrow{w^*} 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.*

As shown in [16, 18], the w^* -extensibility holds for every closed linear subspace of Banach spaces from fairly broad classes including all Asplund spaces, weakly compactly generated spaces (WCG), spaces admitting smooth renorms of any kinds, etc., but not in general.

Theorem 5.2 (limiting normals to direct images of sets under strictly differentiable mappings). *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a mapping between Banach spaces, and let $\Omega \subset X$ with $\bar{x} \in \Omega$. Assume that f is strictly differentiable at \bar{x} and that the restricted mapping $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ is metrically regular at this point. Then*

$$N(\bar{y}; f(\Omega)) \subset (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(N(\bar{x}; \Omega)). \quad (5.1)$$

Furthermore, we have the equalities

$$N(\bar{y}; f(\Omega)) = (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(N(\bar{x}; \Omega)), \quad (5.2)$$

$$\nabla f(\bar{x})^* N(\bar{y}; f(\Omega)) = N(\bar{x}; \Omega) \quad (5.3)$$

provided in addition that $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ is metrically regular around \bar{x} and the following assumptions hold:

- (a) the space $\nabla f(\bar{x})X$ is closed and w^* -extensible in Y ;
- (b) $\tan_{\ker \nabla f(\bar{x}), \Omega}(\bar{x}; \eta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\eta \downarrow 0$.

Proof. To justify inclusion (5.1), pick $y^* \in N(\bar{y}; f(\Omega))$ and, by definition of limiting normals, find sequences $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$, $y_k \xrightarrow{f(\Omega)} \bar{y}$, and $y_k^* \in \widehat{N}_{\varepsilon_k}(y_k; f(\Omega))$ such that $y_k^* \xrightarrow{w^*} y^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. The metric regularity assumption on $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ at \bar{x} yields that

$$\text{dist}(\bar{x}, f^{-1}(y) \cap \Omega) \leq \mu \|y - \bar{y}\|$$

for some $\mu > 0$ and all $y \in f(\Omega)$ sufficiently close to the reference point \bar{y} . This allows us to find $x_k \in f^{-1}(y_k) \cap \Omega$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, with $x_k \rightarrow \bar{x}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then assertion (i) of Theorem 4.5 ensures the existence of a sequence $\gamma_k \downarrow 0$ such that

$$\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y_k^* \in \widehat{N}_{\gamma_k}(x_k; \Omega) \text{ for large } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

which implies that $\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^* \in N(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ by passing to the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This gives (5.1) and also justifies the inclusion “ \subset ” in (5.3).

Let us next prove the opposite inclusions in (5.2) and (5.3) under the additional assumptions made. They surely follow from the fact that for any $x^* \in N(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ we have

$$\emptyset \neq (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(x^*) \subset N(\bar{y}; f(\Omega)). \quad (5.4)$$

To justify (5.4), pick a limiting normal $x^* \in N(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ and find by definition (2.2) sequences $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$, $x_k \xrightarrow{\Omega} \bar{x}$, and $x_k^* \in \widehat{N}_{\varepsilon_k}(x_k; \Omega)$ with $x_k^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Applying now, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, Theorem 4.7(ii) requiring the metric regularity of $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ around \bar{x} and then using assumption (b) as well as the boundedness of the sequence $\{x_k^*\} \subset X^*$ by the uniform boundedness principle, we find from (4.15) sequences $\gamma_k \downarrow 0$ and $\{\widehat{x}_k^*\} \subset X^*$ such that

$$\widehat{x}_k^* \in x_k^* + \gamma_k \mathcal{B}^* \text{ and } (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\widehat{x}_k^*) \neq \emptyset, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (5.5)$$

It follows from the first relationship in (5.5) that $x_k^* \xrightarrow{w^*} x^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, we get $x^* \in \nabla f(\bar{x})^* Y^*$ due the well-known fact that the assumed closedness of the image subspace $\nabla f(\bar{x})X$ in Y implies the w^* -closedness of the adjoint image $\nabla f(\bar{x})^* Y^*$ in X^* .

Thus $(\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(x^*) \neq \emptyset$, and it remains to show for (5.4) that $y^* \in N(\bar{y}; f(\Omega))$ whenever $y^* \in Y^*$ satisfies $\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^* = x^*$. To proceed, we use both relationships in (5.5) and the w^* -extensibility assumption in (b) to derive, as in the proof of [16, Proposition 1.125] and [18, Proposition 3.7], that there is a sequence $\{y_k^*\} \subset Y^*$ with $\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y_k^* = \widehat{x}_k^*$, which

contains a subsequence w^* -convergent to y^* ; assume with no loss of generality that the whole sequence converges as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Applying again Theorem 4.7(ii), we get

$$y_k^* \in \widehat{N}_{\nu_k}(f(x_k), f(\Omega)) \text{ with some } \nu_k \downarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.6)$$

where the latter convergence follows from the expression for ν in (4.16 due to the strict differentiability of f at \bar{x} , the tangential assumption (b) of the theorem, and the boundedness of $\{x_k^*\} \subset X^*$. By passing to the limit in (5.6) as $k \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that $y^* \in N(\bar{y}; f(\Omega))$ and thus complete the proof of the theorem. \triangle

As discussed above, both assumptions in (a) of Theorem 5.2 do not provide serious limitations. By Definition 4.18 and estimate (4.19), condition (b) of the theorem signifies that the contingent cone to Ω around \bar{x} is close enough to the unit sphere of the kernel subspace $\ker \nabla f(\bar{x})$. Note also that all the assumptions in (a) and (b) of Theorem 5.2 are satisfied when the derivative operator $\nabla f(\bar{x})$ is *isomorphic*. The next result implies, in particular, that condition (b) always holds if Ω is the *inverse image* of some set generated by the mapping f under consideration enjoying the RMR property around \bar{x} . In this way the equality relations in (5.2) and (5.3) in Theorem 5.2 extend the corresponding results of [18, Theorem 3.8] for limiting normals to inverse images.

Proposition 5.3 (relationship between the tangential distance to inverse images and the rate of strict differentiability). *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a mapping between Banach spaces, let $\Theta \subset Y$, and let $\Omega := f^{-1}(\Theta) \subset X$. Assume that f is strictly differentiable at $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ and the restrictive mapping $f: X \rightarrow f(X)$ is metrically regular around this point. Then there are numbers $\alpha > 0$ and $\bar{\eta} > 0$ such that for all $x \in (\bar{x} + \eta B) \cap \Omega$ with $\eta \in (0, \bar{\eta}]$ we have the relationship*

$$\text{tand}_{\ker \nabla f(\bar{x}), \Omega}(x) \leq \frac{\alpha r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)}{1 - \alpha [r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)]^2}. \quad (5.7)$$

between the tangential distance and the rate of strict differentiability. In particular,

$$\text{tand}_{\ker \nabla f(\bar{x}), \Omega}(\bar{x}; \eta) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \eta \downarrow 0. \quad (5.8)$$

Proof. It follows directly from the strict differentiability of f at \bar{x} that (5.7) implies (5.8). To justify (5.8), take a modulus $\mu > 0$ of the metric regularity of $f: X \rightarrow f(X)$ around \bar{x} and choose $\bar{\eta} > 0$ such that

$$r_f(\bar{x}; \bar{\eta}) < \min \{1/\mu, 1/(2\sqrt{\mu})\}. \quad (5.9)$$

For any $v \in \ker \nabla f(\bar{x})$ with $\|v\| = 1$ and $x \in (\bar{x} + \eta B) \cap \Omega$ with $0 < \eta < \bar{\eta}$ we have

$$\left\| \frac{f(x + tv) - f(x)}{t} \right\| \leq r_f(\bar{x}; \eta) \quad (5.10)$$

whenever $t > 0$ is sufficiently small. By the metric regularity of $f: X \rightarrow f(X)$ around \bar{x} with modulus μ , for any small $t > 0$ find $x_t \in X$ satisfying

$$f(x_t) = f(x) \text{ and } \|x + tv - x_t\| \leq \mu \|f(x + tv) - f(x)\|.$$

This implies that $x_t \in \Omega$ and, by using (5.10), that

$$\left\| v - \frac{x_t - x}{t} \right\| = \left\| \frac{x + tv - x_t}{t} \right\| \leq \mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta).$$

Consequently we have the following relationships:

$$\begin{aligned} -\mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta) &\leq 1 - \left\| \frac{x_t - x}{t} \right\| \leq \mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta), \\ 1 - \mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta) &\leq \left\| \frac{x_t - x}{t} \right\| \leq 1 + \mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta), \\ \frac{1}{1 + \mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)} &\leq \frac{1}{\|x_t - x\|} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)}, \\ \left| 1 - \frac{t}{\|x_t - x\|} \right| &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)} - \frac{1}{1 + \mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)} = \frac{2\mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)}{1 - \mu^2 [r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)]^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which yield the further estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| v - \frac{x_t - x}{\|x_t - x\|} \right\| &= \left\| \left(v - \frac{x_t - x}{t} \right) \cdot \frac{t}{\|x_t - x\|} + \left(1 - \frac{t}{\|x_t - x\|} \right) v \right\| \\ &\leq \mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta) \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)} + \frac{2\mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)}{1 - \mu^2 [r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)]^2} \\ &= \frac{(3 + \mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta))\mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)}{1 - \mu^2 [r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)]^2} \leq \frac{4\mu r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)}{1 - \mu^2 [r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)]^2}. \end{aligned}$$

It allows us to finally arrive at the inequality

$$\left\| v - \frac{x_t - x}{\|x_t - x\|} \right\| \leq \frac{\alpha r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)}{1 - \alpha [r_f(\bar{x}; \eta)]^2} \quad \text{with } \alpha := \max \{4\mu, \mu^2\},$$

which implies (5.7) by construction (4.18) and completes the proof of the proposition. \triangle

We conclude this section with an *upper estimate* of the limiting normal cone to direct set images under *set-valued* mappings. The results obtained in what follows are generally independent of the corresponding one from Theorem 5.2 in the common setting for both theorems; see more discussions below in Remark 5.5.

To formulate the next theorem, we need to recall two useful properties of set-valued mappings between Banach spaces; see [16, Definition 1.63]. A mapping $F: X \rightrightarrows Y$ is said to be *inner semicontinuous* at $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } F$ if for every sequence $x_k \rightarrow \bar{x}$ with $F(x_k) \neq \emptyset$ there is subsequence of $y_k \in F(x_k)$ converging to \bar{y} as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We say that F is *inner semicompact* at \bar{x} if for every sequence $x_k \rightarrow \bar{x}$ with $F(x_k) \neq \emptyset$ there is a sequence of $y_k \in F(x_k)$ containing a convergent subsequence. Both properties reduce to the usual continuity for the case of single-valued mappings.

It is easy to see that the inner semicompactness property of F always holds of $\dim Y < \infty$ (or, more generally, if F is locally compact around \bar{x} in infinite dimensions), which is not the case for the inner semicontinuity. On the other hand, the inner semicontinuity for *inverse* mappings is implied by the appropriate *metric regularity* of the mapping in question at the corresponding point. In particular, it is proved in Theorem 5.2 that the metric regularity

of $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ at \bar{x} ensures the inner semicontinuity of $f^{-1} \cap \Omega$ at (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) with $\bar{y} := f(\bar{x})$, which is a requirement of Theorem 5.4 for general set-valued mappings.

Having a set $\Omega \subset X$, we define its image under a set-valued mapping $F: X \rightrightarrows Y$ by

$$F(\Omega) := \bigcup_{x \in \Omega} F(x).$$

Theorem 5.4 (limiting normals to set images under set-valued mappings). *Let $F: X \rightrightarrows Y$ be a closed-graph mapping between Asplund spaces, let Ω be a closed subset of X , and let $\bar{y} \in F(\Omega)$. The following assertions hold:*

(i) *Given $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ with $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } F$, assume that the mapping $y \rightrightarrows F^{-1}(y) \cap \Omega$ is inner semicontinuous at (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) , that either Ω is SNC at \bar{x} or F is PSNC at (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) , and that the qualification condition*

$$D_M^* F(\bar{x}, \bar{y})(0) \cap [-N(\bar{x}; \Omega)] = \{0\} \quad (5.11)$$

is satisfied; the latter is automatic together with the PSNC property of F at (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) if F is Lipschitz-like around this point. Then we have the inclusion

$$N(\bar{y}; F(\Omega)) \subset D_N^* F^{-1}(\bar{y}, \bar{x})(N(\bar{x}; \Omega)). \quad (5.12)$$

(ii) *Assume that the mapping $y \rightrightarrows F^{-1}(y) \cap \Omega$ is inner semicompact at \bar{y} and that all the other assumptions in (i) hold for every $\bar{x} \in F^{-1}(\bar{y}) \cap \Omega$. Then we have the inclusion*

$$N(\bar{y}; F(\Omega)) \subset \bigcup_{\bar{x} \in F^{-1}(\bar{y}) \cap \Omega} D_N^* F^{-1}(\bar{y}, \bar{x})(N(\bar{x}; \Omega)). \quad (5.13)$$

Proof. It is sufficient to justify assertion (i); the reader can check that the proof of assertion (ii) is similar. To prove (5.12), pick any $y^* \in N(\bar{y}; F(\Omega))$ and find by definition sequences $y_k \xrightarrow{F(\Omega)} \bar{y}$ and $y_k^* \xrightarrow{w^*} y^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $y_k^* \in \widehat{N}(y_k; F(\Omega))$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By the inner semicontinuity of the mapping $y \rightrightarrows F^{-1}(y) \cap \Omega$ at (\bar{y}, \bar{x}) there is a sequence of $x_k \in F^{-1}(y_k) \cap \Omega$ such that $x_k \rightarrow \bar{x}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Define the closed subsets

$$\Omega_1 := \text{gph } F \text{ and } \Omega_2 := \Omega \times Y. \quad (5.14)$$

of the space $X \times Y$, which is Asplund as a product of Asplund spaces. It is easy to see from the structures of Ω_1 and Ω_2 in (5.14) that

$$(0, y_k^*) \in \widehat{N}((x_k, y_k); \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2) \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

which yields by passing to the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ that

$$(0, y^*) \in N((\bar{x}, \bar{y}); \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2). \quad (5.15)$$

Now we apply to the set intersection in (5.15) the fundamental intersection rule for limiting normals in Asplund spaces from [16, Theorem 3.4]. It is not hard to check that the structures of the sets Ω_1 and Ω_2 in (5.14) and the mixed coderivative construction (2.5) ensure the fulfillment of the limiting qualification condition required in the aforementioned theorem by the assumed qualification condition (5.11).

Furthermore, the PSNC condition imposed on F at (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) in the assumptions of the theorem means in fact that the set Ω_1 in (5.14) is PSNC at (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) with respect to X while the other set Ω_2 is automatically strongly *PSNC* at this point (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) with respect to Y , which is required in [16, Theorem 3.4]. On the other hand, if Ω is assumed to be *SNC* at \bar{x} , then Ω_2 in (5.14) is obviously *SNC* at (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) , which meets the alternative requirements of [16, Theorem 3.4]. By the latter result we thus have

$$N((\bar{x}, \bar{y}); \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2) \subset N((\bar{x}, \bar{y}); \Omega_1) + N((\bar{x}, \bar{y}); \Omega_2)$$

that allows us to represent the pair $(0, y^*)$ in (5.15) as

$$(0, y^*) = (-x^*, y^*) + (x^*, 0).$$

with some $(-x^*, y^*) \in N((\bar{x}, \bar{y}); \text{gph } F)$ and $x^* \in N(\bar{x}; \Omega)$. Taking into account definition (2.4) of the normal coderivative for the case of the inverse mapping $F^{-1}: Y \rightrightarrows X$, we finally arrive at (5.12) under the assumptions in (i). To complete the proof of the theorem, it remains to observe that $D_M^* F(\bar{x}, \bar{y})(0) = \{0\}$ if F is Lipschitz-like around (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) by [16, Theorem 4.10] and that we automatically have the PSNC property at (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) for such mappings F by [16, Theorem 1.43]. \triangle

Remark 5.5 (discussions on the results for limiting normals to set images). It is easy to check the relationship

$$y^* \in D_N^* F^{-1}(\bar{y}, \bar{x})(x^*) \iff -x^* \in D_N^* F(\bar{x}, \bar{y})(-y^*)$$

between the normal coderivative of an arbitrary mapping $F: X \rightrightarrows Y$ at $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } F$ and the one for its inverse F^{-1} . Using this relationship and expression (4.14) for the normal coderivative of single-valued and strictly differentiable mappings, we conclude that inclusion (5.1) of Theorem 5.2 reduces to (5.13) in the case of strict differentiability. Observe that all the assumptions of Theorem 5.4(i) hold under those needed for (5.1) in Theorem 5.2 (see the discussion on inner semicontinuity before the formulation of Theorem 5.4) except the general *Banach* space setting of Theorem 5.2 versus the *Asplund* space setting of Theorem 5.4. Note also that Theorem 5.2 contains the *equality* relationships (5.2) and (5.3) under the additional assumptions imposed therein, which do not have any counterparts in the general nonsmooth and set-valued setting of Theorem 5.4 even in finite dimensions.

6 Other Normal Cones to Set Images

In this section we obtain some analogs of the results established in Section 4 for Fréchet normals in the new case of *Hölder normals* (including *proximal* ones) to set images under differentiable mappings between Banach spaces. Similar results are also derived from those in Section 5 for the *convexified normal cone* to set images in Asplund spaces.

Given a set $\Omega \subset X$ and a number $s \in (0, 1]$, the *Hölder s -normal cone* to Ω at $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{N}^s(\bar{x}; \Omega) := \left\{ x^* \in X \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists \sigma \geq 0, \eta > 0 \text{ such that } \langle x^*, x - \bar{x} \rangle \leq \sigma \|x - \bar{x}\|^{1+s} \\ \text{whenever } x \in (\bar{x} + \eta B) \cap \Omega \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

For $s = 1$, the set (6.1) is known as the *proximal normal cone* to Ω at \bar{x} . Obviously

$$\widehat{N}^s(\bar{x}; \Omega) \subset \widehat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega) \text{ for all } 0 < s \leq 1. \quad (6.2)$$

Introducing further the *Hölder s -tangent cone* to Ω at $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ by the duality/polarity correspondence

$$\widehat{T}^s(\bar{x}; \Omega) := \{v \in X \mid \langle x^*, v \rangle \leq 0 \text{ for all } x^* \in \widehat{N}^s(\bar{x}; \Omega)\}, \quad (6.3)$$

we observe the relationship between (6.3) and the contingent cone (4.2):

$$\text{clco } T(\bar{x}; \Omega) \subset \widehat{T}^s(\bar{x}; \Omega) \text{ for each } 0 < s \leq 1,$$

which follows from inclusion (4.3) by using the polarity in (6.2).

Given now a mapping $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between Banach spaces, we say that f is *Hölder s -differentiable* at \bar{x} with $s \in (0, 1]$ if there exist a neighborhood U of \bar{x} , a constant $\gamma > 0$, and a bounded linear operator $A: X \rightarrow Y$ such that

$$\frac{\|f(x) - f(\bar{x}) - A(x - \bar{x})\|}{\|x - \bar{x}\|^{1+s}} \leq \gamma \text{ for all } x \in U \setminus \{\bar{x}\}. \quad (6.4)$$

It is not hard to check that the operator A in (6.4) is unique if exists; we call it the *Hölder s -derivative* of f at \bar{x} and denote for simplicity by $\nabla f(\bar{x})$ if no confusion arises. It is easy to check that Hölder differentiability implies Fréchet differentiability at the reference point with the same derivative operator.

The next theorem gives (independent) Hölder counterparts, whenever $s \in (0, 1]$, of Theorem 4.2 for Fréchet normal to direct images.

Theorem 6.1 (Hölder normals to direct images of sets under differentiable mappings). *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a mapping between Banach spaces, let Ω be a subset of X with $\bar{x} \in \Omega$, and let $s \in (0, 1]$. Assume that f is Hölder s -differentiable at \bar{x} and that the restricted mapping $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ is metrically regular at this point. Then we have the equality*

$$\widehat{N}^s(\bar{y}; f(\Omega)) = (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\widehat{N}^s(\bar{x}; \Omega)) \text{ with } \bar{y} := f(\bar{x}). \quad (6.5)$$

If furthermore the subspace $\nabla f(\bar{x})X$ is closed in Y and if the kernel condition

$$\ker \nabla f(\bar{x}) \subset T^s(\bar{x}; \Omega)$$

is satisfied, then we also have

$$\nabla f(\bar{x})^* \widehat{N}^s(\bar{y}; f(\Omega)) = \widehat{N}^s(\bar{x}; \Omega). \quad (6.6)$$

Proof. It easily follows from the Fréchet differentiability of \bar{x} (which is a consequence of its Hölder s -differentiability) that there are constants $\ell > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\|f(x) - f(\bar{x})\| \leq \ell \|x - \bar{x}\| \text{ whenever } \|x - \bar{x}\| \leq \eta.$$

Fix any $y^* \in \widehat{N}^s(\bar{y}; f(\Omega))$ and observe by (6.1) that there are $\sigma > 0$ and $\eta_1 > 0$ for which

$$\langle y^*, y - \bar{y} \rangle \leq \sigma \|y - \bar{y}\|^{1+s} \text{ whenever } y \in (\bar{y} + \eta_1 B) \cap f(\Omega).$$

Therefore we get for $x \in \Omega$ sufficiently close to \bar{x} that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla f(\bar{x})^*(y^*), x - \bar{x} \rangle &= \langle y^*, \nabla f(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) \rangle \leq \langle y^*, \nabla f(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) + f(\bar{x}) - f(x) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle y^*, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle \leq \|y^*\| \gamma \|x - \bar{x}\|^{1+s} + \sigma \ell^{1+s} \|x - \bar{x}\|^{1+s} \\ &\leq \sigma_1 \|x - \bar{x}\|^{1+s} \text{ with } \sigma_1 := \|y^*\| \gamma + \sigma \ell^{1+s}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is the constant taken from (6.4). This shows that $y^* \in (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\widehat{N}^s(\bar{x}; \Omega))$ and thus justifies the inclusion “ \subset ” in (6.5).

To prove the opposite inclusion in (6.5), fix any $y^* \in (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\widehat{N}^s(\bar{x}; \Omega))$ and immediately conclude that $\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^* \in \widehat{N}^s(\bar{x}; \Omega)$. We need to show that $y^* \in \widehat{N}^s(\bar{y}; f(\Omega))$. To proceed, find by definition (6.1) numbers $\sigma > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\langle \nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^*, x - \bar{x} \rangle \leq \sigma \|x - \bar{x}\|^{1+s} \text{ for all } x \in (\bar{x} + \eta B) \cap \Omega \quad (6.7)$$

and derive from this the estimate

$$\langle y^*, \nabla f(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) \rangle \leq \sigma \|x - \bar{x}\|^{1+s}, \quad x \in (\bar{x} + \eta B) \cap \Omega.$$

The latter implies by definition (6.4) of Hölder differentiability the existence of $\gamma > 0$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \langle y^*, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle &= \langle y^*, f(x) - f(\bar{x}) - \nabla f(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) \rangle + \langle y^*, \nabla f(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) \rangle \\ &\leq (\gamma \|y^*\| + \sigma) \|x - \bar{x}\|^{1+s}, \quad x \in (\bar{x} + \eta B) \cap \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Using now the metric regularity of $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ at \bar{x} similarly to the proof of Theorem 4.2, for any $y \in f(\Omega)$ near \bar{y} we find $\mu > 0$ and $x_y \in f^{-1}(y) \cap \Omega$ satisfying the estimate

$$\|x_y - \bar{x}\| \leq \mu \|y - \bar{y}\| \leq \eta,$$

where $\eta > 0$ is taken from (6.7). Combining all the above allows us to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle y^*, y - \bar{y} \rangle &= \langle y^*, f(x_y) - f(\bar{x}) \rangle \leq (\gamma \|y^*\| + \sigma) \|x_y - \bar{x}\|^{1+s} \\ &\leq (\gamma \|y^*\| + \sigma) \mu^{1+s} \|y - \bar{y}\|^{1+s} \end{aligned}$$

whenever y is close to \bar{y} . This implies that $y^* \in \widehat{N}^s(\bar{y}; f(\Omega))$ and thus completes the proof of equality (6.5). The justification of the other equality (6.6) under the kernel condition imposed is similar to the corresponding proof in Theorem 4.2. \triangle

Similarly to the case of Fréchet normals we derive consequences of Theorem 6.1 for Hölder normals to *inverse images* of sets in Banach spaces.

Corollary 6.2 (Hölder normal cones to inverse images). *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a mapping between Banach spaces, and let Θ be a subset of Y such that f is Hölder s -differentiable at \bar{x} with $s \in (0, 1]$ and that $\bar{y} := f(\bar{x}) \in \Theta$. The following assertions hold:*

(i) *Assume that the restricted mapping $f: f^{-1}(\Theta) \rightarrow \Theta \cap f(X)$ is metrically regular at \bar{x} . Then the equality*

$$(\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1} \widehat{N}^s(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\Theta)) = \widehat{N}^s(\bar{y}; \Theta \cap f(X))$$

is satisfied. Furthermore, we have the equality

$$\widehat{N}^s(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\Theta)) = \nabla f(\bar{x})^* \widehat{N}^s(\bar{y}; \Theta \cap f(X))$$

provided that the mapping $f: X \rightarrow f(X)$ is metrically regular at \bar{x} .

(ii) Assume that the original mapping $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is metrically regular at \bar{x} . Then we have the equalities

$$(\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1} \widehat{N}^s(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\Theta)) = \widehat{N}^s(\bar{y}; \Theta),$$

$$\widehat{N}^s(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\Theta)) = \nabla f(\bar{x})^* \widehat{N}^s(\bar{y}; \Theta).$$

Proof. Assertion (i) is justified similarly to the proof of Corollary 4.4 with the use of Theorem 6.1 instead of Theorem 4.2. Asserting (ii) follows from (i) by a simple observation that $\bar{y} \in \text{int } f(X)$ if $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is metrically regular at \bar{x} , and hence the set $f(X)$ can be removed from the corresponding formulas in (i). \triangle

Next we consider the so-called *convexified normal cone* to $\Omega \subset X$ at $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ defined as the norm closure “cl” in X^* of the convex hull “co” of the limiting normal cone (2.2) by

$$\overline{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega) := \text{clco } N(\bar{x}; \Omega). \quad (6.8)$$

To compare (6.8) with the *Clarke normal cone* $N_C(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ defined in general Banach spaces [5], we use the relationship

$$N_C(\bar{x}; \Omega) = \text{cl}^* \text{co } N(\bar{x}; \Omega) \quad (6.9)$$

established in [16, Theorem 3.57] provided that X is Asplund and Ω is locally closed around \bar{x} , where cl^* stands for the weak* closure in X^* . It follows from (6.8), (6.9), and the Mazur weak closure theorem that $\overline{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega) = N_C(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ for closed sets in reflexive spaces.

Employing now the results of Section 5 on limiting normals to direct and inverse images of sets, we derive the corresponding results for the convexified normal cone (6.8) in general Banach spaces and hence for its Clarke counterpart for locally closed subsets of reflexive spaces. We start with the following simple proposition.

Proposition 6.3 (convexified normal cone to direct images). *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a mapping between Banach spaces, and let Ω be a nonempty subset of X . Having $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ with $\bar{y} := f(\bar{x})$, assume that f is strictly differentiable at \bar{x} and that the restricted mapping $f: \Omega \rightarrow f(\Omega)$ is metrically regular at \bar{x} . Then we have the inclusion*

$$\overline{N}(\bar{y}; f(\Omega)) \subset (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\overline{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega)), \quad (6.10)$$

which holds as equality provided that either $\nabla f(\bar{x})$ is isomorphic or $\overline{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega) = \widehat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$.

Proof. Using definition (6.8) and inclusion (5.1) of Theorem 5.2, which holds under the assumptions made, we get

$$\overline{N}(\bar{y}; f(\Omega)) \subset \text{clco}[(\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(N(\bar{x}; \Omega))] \subset \text{clco}[(\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\overline{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega))]. \quad (6.11)$$

It easy follows from the linearity and continuity of the operator $\nabla f(\bar{x})^*: Y^* \rightarrow X^*$ that the set $(\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\overline{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega))$ is closed and convex. Thus (6.11) implies (6.10).

The converse inclusion to (6.10) obviously holds if the operator $\nabla f(\bar{x}): X \rightarrow Y$ is an isomorphism. If, on the other hand, the assumption $\overline{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega) = \widehat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega)$ and equality (4.6) in Theorem 4.2 yield that

$$(\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\overline{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega)) = (\nabla f(\bar{x})^*)^{-1}(\widehat{N}(\bar{x}; \Omega)) = \widehat{N}(\bar{y}; f(\Omega)) \subset \overline{N}(\bar{y}; f(\Omega))$$

justifying the equality in (6.10) and thus completing the proof of the proposition. \triangle

The next result concerning the convexified normal cone (6.8) to inverse images of sets under strictly differentiable mappings is significantly more involved.

Theorem 6.4 (convexified normals to inverse images). *Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a mapping between Banach spaces, and let Θ be a subset of Y such that $\bar{y} := f(\bar{x}) \in \Theta$ for some $\bar{x} \in X$ at which f is strictly differentiable. The following assertions hold:*

(i) *If $\nabla f(\bar{x}): X \rightarrow Y$ is surjective, then*

$$\overline{N}(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\Theta)) = \nabla f(\bar{x})^* \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta). \quad (6.12)$$

(ii) *Let X be Asplund, let $Y = \mathbb{R}^n$, and let Θ be locally closed around \bar{y} . Then we have*

$$\overline{N}(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\Theta)) \subset \nabla f(\bar{x})^* \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta) \quad (6.13)$$

provided that the qualification condition

$$\ker \nabla f(\bar{x})^* \cap \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta) = \{0\} \quad (6.14)$$

is satisfied. The equality holds in (6.13) if in addition $\overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta) = \widehat{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta)$.

Proof. Under the assumptions in (i) we have from [16, Theorem 1.17] that

$$N(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\Theta)) = \nabla f(\bar{x})^* N(\bar{y}; \Theta) \subset \nabla f(\bar{x})^* \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta). \quad (6.15)$$

The set $\nabla f(\bar{x})^* \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta)$ in (6.15) is obviously convex. Let us show that it is closed in the norm topology of X^* under the imposed surjectivity assumption on $\nabla f(\bar{x})$. Indeed, pick any $x^* \in \text{cl}[\nabla f(\bar{x})^* \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta)]$ and find sequences of $y_k^* \in \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta)$ and $x_k^* = \nabla f(\bar{x})^* y_k^*$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_k^* \rightarrow x^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Taking any (x_m^*, y_m^*) and (x_l^*, y_l^*) from the above sequences and using the surjectivity of $\nabla f(\bar{x})$, we get

$$\|x_m^* - x_l^*\| = \|\nabla f(\bar{x})^* y_m^* - \nabla f(\bar{x})^* y_l^*\| \geq \mu \|y_m^* - y_l^*\|$$

with some constant $\mu > 0$; see [16, Lemma 1.18]. This implies that $\{y_k^*\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the norm topology of Y^* , and hence it converges to an element $y^* \in Y^*$, which surely belongs to the cone $\overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta)$ due to the norm-closedness on the latter in Y^* . By this and the continuity of $\nabla f(\bar{x})^*: Y^* \rightarrow X^*$, we have $x^* = \nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^* \in \nabla f(\bar{x})^* \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta)$, which justifies the norm-closedness of the set $\nabla f(\bar{x})^* \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta)$ in X^* . Thus taking the convex closure of

the sets in (6.15), we arrive at the inclusion “ \subset ” in (6.12). The converse inclusion “ \supset ” in (6.12) easily follows from the one

$$N(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\Theta)) \supset \nabla f(\bar{x})^* N(\bar{y}; \Theta)$$

in (6.15) by taking the convex closure on both sides therein and using the linearity and continuity of the operator $\nabla f(\bar{x})^*$. This completes the proof of assertion (i) in the theorem.

To justify assertion (ii), we employ the well-developed calculus of limiting normals in Asplund spaces [16] that do not require restrictive assumptions of the surjectivity type as in (i). By [16, Theorem 3.8], which holds under the assumptions imposed in (ii) for the fulfillment of (6.13), we get the inclusion

$$N(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\Theta)) \subset \nabla f(\bar{x})^* N(\bar{y}; \Theta)$$

that implies due to definition (6.8) that

$$N(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\Theta)) \subset \nabla f(\bar{x})^* \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta). \quad (6.16)$$

To get (6.13) from (6.16), it is sufficient to prove that the (convex) set

$$\Lambda := \nabla f(\bar{x})^* \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta) \quad (6.17)$$

is closed in the norm topology of X^* . Take a sequence $\{x_k^*\} \subset \Lambda$ that converges to some $x^* \in X^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and find by (6.17) a sequence $\{y_k^*\} \subset Y^*$ such that

$$x_k^* = \nabla f(\bar{x})^* y_k^* \text{ and } y_k^* \in \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6.18)$$

Let us show that the sequence $\{y_k^*\}$ in (6.18) is bounded under the assumed qualification condition (6.14). If it is not the case, there is a subsequence of $\{y_k^*\}$ such that (without relabeling) $\|y_k^*\| \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We have from the equality in (6.18) that

$$\frac{x_k^*}{\|y_k^*\|} = \nabla f(\bar{x})^* \left(\frac{y_k^*}{\|y_k^*\|} \right), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6.19)$$

and can assume due to the finite dimensionality of Y that $\tilde{y}_k^* := y_k^* / \|y_k^*\| \rightarrow y^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for some y^* with $\|y^*\| = 1$. It follows that $y^* \in \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta)$, since $\overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta)$ is a closed cone. By passing to the limit in (6.19) as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using the continuity of the operator $\nabla f(\bar{x})^*$, we get $y^* \in \ker \nabla f(\bar{y})^*$ and arrive therefore at a contradiction with the qualification condition (6.14). Thus the sequence $\{y_k^*\}$ is bounded in $Y^* = \mathbb{R}^n$, which implies that

$$x^* \in \nabla f(\bar{x})^* y^* \subset \overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta)$$

by passing to the limit in (6.18) as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This justifies inclusion (6.13). The converse inclusion to (6.13) follows under the condition $\overline{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta) = \hat{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta)$ from the one

$$\hat{N}(\bar{x}; f^{-1}(\Theta)) \supset \nabla f(\bar{x})^* \hat{N}(\bar{y}; \Theta)$$

established in [16, Theorem 1.14(i)] for mappings $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between Banach spaces that are merely Fréchet differentiable at \bar{x} . This completes the proof of the theorem. \triangle

References

- [1] A. V. Arutyunov, E. R. Avakov and A. F. Izmailov, Directional regularity and metric regularity, *SIAM J. Optim.* **18** (2007), 810–833.
- [2] D. Azé, Unified theory for metric regularity for multifunctions, *J. Convex Anal.* **13** (2006), 225–252.
- [3] J. M. Borwein and H. M. Strójas, Tangential approximations, *Nonlinear Anal.* **9** (1985), 1347–1366.
- [4] J. M. Borwein and Q. J. Zhu, *Techniques of Variational Analysis*, Springer, New York, 2005.
- [5] F. H. Clarke, *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis*, Wiley, New York, 1983.
- [6] A. V. Dmitruk, A. A. Milyutin and N. P. Osmolovskii, Lyusternik’s theorem and the theory of extrema, *Russian Math. Surv.* **35** (1980), 11–51.
- [7] A. L. Dontchev, A. S. Lewis and R. T. Rockafellar, The radius of metric regularity, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **355** (2003), 493–517.
- [8] M. Fabian and B. S. Mordukhovich, Sequential normal compactness versus topological normal compactness in variational analysis, *Nonlinear Anal.* **54** (2003), 1057–1067.
- [9] A. D. Ioffe, Regular points of Lipschitz functions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **251** (1977), 61–69.
- [10] A. D. Ioffe, Codirectional compactness, metric regularity and subdifferential calculus, in *Constructive, Experimental and Nonlinear Analysis*, edited by M. Théra, *Canad. Math. Soc. Conf. Proc.* **27** (2000), 123–164.
- [11] A. D. Ioffe, Metric regularity and subdifferential calculus, *Russian Math. Surv.* **55** (2000), 501–558.
- [12] A. D. Ioffe, On regularity concepts in variational analysis, *J. Fixed Point Theory Appl.*, to appear.
- [13] A. Jourani and L. Thibault, Coderivatives of multivalued mappings, locally compact cones and metric regularity, *Nonlinear Anal.* **35** (1999), 925–945.
- [14] D. Klatte and B. Kummer, *Nonsmooth Equations in Optimization: Regularity, Calculus, Methods, and Applications*, Kluwer, Boston, 2002.
- [15] B. S. Mordukhovich, Complete characterizations of openness, metric regularity, and Lipschitzian properties of multifunctions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **340** (1993), 1–35.
- [16] B. S. Mordukhovich, *Variational Analysis and Generalized Differentiation, I: Basic Theory*, Springer, Berlin, 2006.

- [17] B. S. Mordukhovich, *Variational Analysis and Generalized Differentiation, II: Applications*, Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [18] B. S. Mordukhovich and B. Wang, Restrictive metric regularity and generalized differential calculus in Banach spaces, *Int. J. Maths. Math. Sci.* **50** (2004), 2650–2683.
- [19] S. M. Robinson, Equations on locally thin sets, *Math. Oper. Res.*, to appear.
- [20] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J-B. Wets, *Variational Analysis*, Springer, Berlin, 1998.
- [21] W. Schirotzek, *Nonsmooth Analysis*, Springer, Berlin, 2007.